

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 310 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

What Are the Prospects for the President's Legislative Program?

Moderator, ORVILLE HITCHCOCK

Speaker

GERALD R. FORD, JR.

Interrogators

THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD

WELDON JAMES



—COMING—

—December 29, 1953—

Flying Saucers: Fact or Illusion?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 19, NUMBER 33



\$5.00 A YEAR, 25c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOLUME 19

No. 33



What Are the Prospects for the President's Legislative Program?



The Broadcast of December 15, 1953, from 9:00 to 9:45 P.M., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from the Memorial Coliseum of the University of Kentucky, Lexington, under the auspices of the Community Concert and Lecture Series.



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recording made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

CONGRESSMAN GERALD R. FORD, Jr.—Republican of Michigan. Born on July 14, 1913, he spent his childhood in Grand Rapids, Michigan, where he attended elementary and high schools. He graduated from the University of Michigan with a B. A. degree in 1935, and went on to the Yale University Law School. Beginning a private law practice in Michigan, he left it in 1942 to serve in the U. S. Navy for four years. Returning to civilian life, he resumed his law practice, and in 1948 was elected to Congress. During his first term of office he was appointed to the Committee on Public Works; re-elected in 1951, he became a member of the House Committee on Appropriations. In the 82nd Congress he has been a member of the Army Civil Functions Sub-Committee and the Emergency Agency Sub-Committee of the Committee on Appropriations.

Interrogators: **THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD**—Editor of the *Lexington Herald*, former Democratic Senator from Kentucky.

WELDON JAMES—Associate Editor, *Louisville Courier-Journal*.

Moderator: **ORVILLE HITCHCOCK**—Professor of Speech, State University of Iowa.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by T Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50) six weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 25c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942 at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

What Are the Prospects for the President's Legislative Program?

Announcer:

Tonight, Town Meeting comes to you from the heart of the Blue Grass country, Lexington, Kentucky, and we are originating from the impressive Memorial Coliseum, which is the home of the University of Kentucky basketball team. Famous for its beautiful horse farms, Lexington was one of the first settlements in the West and was the location of the first college west of the Alleghenies. Town Meeting is here for the Community Concert and Lecture Series, the largest series of its kind in the nation, with more than six thousand members.

It is now in its fourth season in the new coliseum, and features foremost concert artists and lecturers in twelve programs during the year. The Series membership this season is the largest in its history. Town Hall wishes it continued success in the years ahead.

Now to preside as moderator for tonight's discussion here is Dr. Orville Hitchcock, Professor of Speech at the State University of Iowa. Dr. Hitchcock.

Dr. Hitchcock:

Thank you. On Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of this week, a most important conference will be held in Washington, D.C. These are the days which President Eisenhower has set aside for meetings with Congressional leaders to discuss the legislative program for the next session of Congress—the second session of the eighty-third Congress which will convene on January 6. In preparation for this conference, the President met with his Cabinet twice last week and again today.

As you might expect, political leaders are not in agreement over the accomplishments of the first session of the eighty-third Congress. Some say that it accomplished much; some say that it accomplished little.

All seem to agree, however, that consideration of a fairly large number of major problems was left for the session which is soon to begin, and the political commentaries are crowded with references to this *must* legislation—the program which the Republican Party will seek to enact during the next year. President Eisenhower, himself, on December 2nd, referred to the need for a progressive, dynamic program and stated, "Unless the Republican Party can develop and enact such a program for the American people, it does not deserve to remain in power."

This, then, is our subject for tonight: "What Are the Prospects for the President's Legislative Program?" To help us answer this question, we are fortunate in having with us an outstanding member of Congress, Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Republican of Michigan, and two interrogators, prominent newspapermen in Kentucky, Mr. Tom Underwood, editor of the *Lexington Herald* and former member of Congress, both the House and the Senate, and Mr. Weldon James, Associate Editor of the *Louisville Courier Journal*. Representative Sidney R. Yates, Democrat of Illinois, who was to have been on the program, could not be with us because of poor weather conditions, and Mr. Underwood and Mr. James graciously agreed at the eleventh hour to substitute for him as interrogators.

First, we will hear from Congressman Ford. Mr. Ford is an attorney, served in the navy for four years during the War, and has been in Congress since 1948. He is a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, Chairman of the Army Subcommittee on Appropriations, and a member of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee. Congressman Ford.

Congressman Ford:

Prospects are excellent for President Eisenhower's legislative program in the coming session of the eighty-third Congress. I say this because legislators and laymen alike have come to know the complete sincerity of Dwight D. Eisenhower, a President who puts the general welfare before party politics. Some may not agree with all the details of the Eisenhower program, but they certainly must concur with his forthright and honest approach to our mutual problems. Bearing in mind the many inherited problems of the previous administration, a very favorable record was made during the first session.

This constructive *s p a d e* work will bring even more satisfactory results in the months ahead. When President Eisenhower assumed office in January of this year, he solemnly pledged sincere and effective co-operation between the executive and legislative branches of our government. To insure success of his party's program for the benefit of the nation, he fully realized and understood the need and necessity for whole-hearted co-operation between the Congress and the President. This refreshing attitude of the newly inaugurated President gained for him the immediate respect of most members of Congress—Democrats and Republicans alike.

Because of such teamwork, a sub-

stantial part of the program submitted by the President during 1953 was approved by the Congress. On December 2nd, 1953, President Eisenhower stated he will submit a progressive and dynamic legislative program to enhance the welfare, the stability, and the prosperity of our nation and its many people. He was optimistic that such a program would be approved by the House and the Senate. I concur in that prediction.

Within the next several days, an important conference between the President and his legislative leaders is scheduled. This conference will result in specific legislation to be submitted to the Congress as a whole. In the time available and on the eve of this conference, it would be presumptuous to attempt to pinpoint what the detailed recommendations may be. Nevertheless, I will outline a few of the problems that will certainly be on the agenda.

Unquestionably there will be a proposal to reduce the federal tax burden, to revise and reform federal tax legislation to eliminate inequities. We can expect a thorough review of all farm programs and a detailed plan for agriculture that will benefit both farmers and consumers. Labor-management legislation aimed at providing a proper balance between workers and employers will definitely be before the House and Senate. Searching scrutiny will continue on all appropriation bills so that government expenditures can be further reduced. Federal fiscal responsibility is a matter of the highest priority.

The existing Social Security Law will be examined to broaden the coverage, improve the financing, and terminate inequities. Other problems definitely to be covered are: national defense policy, state-

hood for Alaska and Hawaii, the Reciprocal Trade Act, housing laws, and the St. Lawrence Seaway. We can feel confident that the proposals to meet the problems will be presented by the President in complete frankness, non-partisanship, and spiritual truthfulness, which are the guideposts of the man who months ago dedicated himself to a great crusade and who has moved forward without deviation. The President and the Congress, by united and constructive effort, can achieve a sound legislative program for America and the free world. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr. Ford. Now seated at my left are two interrogators, Mr. Tom Underwood and Mr. Weldon James. I wonder, Mr. Underwood, if you would like to start us off with a question for Mr. Ford.

Mr. Underwood: Yes, Dr. Hitchcock, I suppose it would be proper to ask the first question first, which is . . . Gerald, if you will pardon me just a second to say that it was my pleasure to have served with Congressman Ford, and he is a very fine member. It was a pleasure to do that and I am glad to receive him here, and that is why I am here tonight—a good deal more reluctantly than many of you will believe.

Mr. Hitchcock: You were in Congress with him, Mr. Underwood?

Mr. Underwood: Yes, and I know the respect in which he is held, and I am glad to receive him here, even though I don't want him to say anything that is not questioned.

Mr. Hitchcock: That proves that we are all friends.

Mr. Underwood: Then the first question first is this: Do you believe that the budget can be balanced this year and the defense

of this country can be properly supported?

Mr. Hitchcock: I guess that is the dilemma. Can we take care of both? Can we balance the budget and still keep the defense of our country in proper condition? Mr. Ford.

Mr. Ford: Of course that is one of the sixty-four dollar questions. I believe that we can come reasonably close, through the untiring efforts of the executive branch of the government and the continued scrutiny by the legislative branch of the government. We can almost, in the fiscal year 1954, balance the federal budget. I would like to give you a little background on that to show you the handicaps from which we started.

In January of 1953 this year, former President Truman, in his State of the Union message, his budget presentation on January 9, said that the federal deficit for the fiscal year 1954 would be between 9 and one-half and 12 billion dollars. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, after careful analysis and review in March of this year, said that by watching the expenditures they could cut that deficit down to about 5.8 billion dollars. Then in August of this year, Mr. Humphrey, after a further look at the situation, said that our deficit for this fiscal year will be closer to 3.8 billion dollars—quite a cut in the deficit from what had been predicted in January of this year.

I think it is solely the responsibility of the untiring economy efforts of those in the executive as well as in the legislative branches of the government, and despite that narrowing of the gap between expenditures and receipts, I don't believe that our national defense picture has been harmed in any way whatsoever. As a matter

of fact, we are going to have a stronger army, navy, and air force, come June 30th of next year, than we have had in the past three or four years.

Mr. Hitchcock: Are we talking, Mr. Ford, about the current year—the year ending July 1, 1954—or are we talking about the year beginning July 1, 1954?

Mr. Ford: The fiscal year 1954 started July 1 of this year and ends next June 30. So the anticipated deficit, according to the latest figures as I quoted them, is close to 3.8 billion dollars—quite a reduction from the prediction of last January by Mr. Truman.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, sir. Now, Mr. James, would you like to ask the second question, second?

Mr. James: Well, I don't think this question ought to be the first, but I am appalled at any suggestion that you can, according to the Administration's recent announcement, reduce the United States Marine Corps by 23,000 men and still have just as strong a Marine Corps as before. Those ten per cent figures apply, let's say, to the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps, too. But it reminds me of a very good wisecrack that was made soon after the Secretary of Defense said look what a wonderful job we are doing! We have already whacked 10 or 15 per cent off the military; we are going to whack some more; and we are going to wind up with a better army, a stronger air force, and a mightier navy than ever before. The logical question then is: if you are, why not cut out several billions more and make them stronger than ever?

Mr. Hitchcock: Before you answer that question, Mr. Ford, I might point out to the audience that Mr. James was in the marines during

the War, and that this may be partly an argument between the navy and the marines. Would you like to grapple with that question for a bit?

Mr. Ford: Mr. James, on Monday noon I attended one of the meetings of the National Press Club in Washington, and I heard Admiral Radford make one of the speeches before this regular Monday noon meeting which I believe they have. One of the points covered by Admiral Radford—who, by the way, as most of you probably know, is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—his point was precisely this: that they feel they can get a better ratio of fire-power manpower to over-all manpower than they have gotten in the past, and I think that is particularly true in the army, maybe not quite so true in the Marine Corps.

But I think that according to Admiral Radford, that they can reduce the ratio, so they get more effective combat efficiency and less overhead. The ten per cent, which rumor has it, is going to be cut in personnel from the navy and the army, and possibly the marine corps, will not interfere whatsoever with our combat efficiency. I don't think the ten per cent cut that has been rumored will affect the air force. In fact, I have seen very strong statements to the effect that the air force personnel has now been leveled off and will not be reduced further.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. James?

Mr. James: In all seriousness, Mr. Ford, I think that the crux of the matter about what Mr. Eisenhower is going to be able to get from Congress is going to depend on that defense program—what cuts can be made and what you do with foreign trade. On both

of those questions, I would like to ask if the Republican Party seems to you to be as badly split as it has been reported in the daily press?

Mr. Ford: On the question of military appropriations—and I can well attest to the struggle we had last year, because I am in a Military Appropriations Subcommittee—the Republican Party last year, during the last session of the Congress, did support President Eisenhower, down the line practically, on the reductions and appropriations for the army, navy, and air force. It was a case where the Democrats as a whole, almost without exception, fought President Eisenhower on economy in the national defense picture.

On the other question which you asked: namely, foreign trade, the President this last session did recommend to the Congress that the Reciprocal Trade Act be extended. It was extended for another year. We now have the Randall Commission holding hearings—I believe they just concluded their hearings. The Randall Commission is to make its recommendation to the House and Senate some time in January, which will be the basis for a proposed extension of reciprocal trade after June 12, 1954.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Underwood, I notice that you are getting restless, and I think that means you have another question here.

Mr. Underwood: I never could, in the time I spent in Congress, I never did get so that I could make a statement in the form of a question. Yes, I would just like to make this speech: that so far as the inherited mess in Washington concerned, to which Gerald has referred, if Adlai Stevenson had been elected President of the United States, and, after he had

been there a year, he said that he couldn't do anything because of the way it had been done before he reached there, I would say that he was a failure. (*Applause.*) I say that with no disrespect for the President, but the question I want to ask you is: Do you favor increasing the debt limit 15 billion dollars, if you can balance the budget, or very nearly bring it into balance, so nearly that it would be unnecessary to increase your cash expenditure?

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Ford, we will let you defend President Eisenhower before you answer the specific question, if you would like to.

Mr. Ford: Let me say, Mr. Moderator, that I think the President did make an excellent record and he certainly made progress with the House and Senate during the last session. He submitted 44 so-called Eisenhower legislative recommendations to the Congress, and this last session of the Congress, the House and Senate, approved 32 of them—for a batting average of 72.7.

I would just like to contrast that batting average of President Eisenhower in the first session of this last Congress with the six-year batting average of former President Truman. (*Applause.*) According to the Congressional Quarterly, one of the fine non-partisan reporting agencies in Washington, the six-year batting average of former President Truman was about 42.6, so Ike in his first year has done almost twice as well as Mr. Truman did in his six-year average.

Mr. Hitchcock: May I just explain to the radio audience, who can't see us, that I am fortunately sitting between these two gentlemen who are trying to talk all at once, and Mr. James is trying to come in, but let's let Mr. Underwood

make a statement, and then Mr. James.

Mr. Underwood: That's absolutely true. He is absolutely right about that, and the reason is that President Eisenhower has received so much more support from the Democrats than President Truman did from the Republicans. *(Laughter.)* And that brings me to a question, since I am on here tonight just to help him out, how much help do you think that the Republican national administration will need from the Democrats during the coming session of Congress?

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Ford, you won't forget the debt limit which we also have somewhere to answer here, too.

Mr. Ford: Let me answer the last question first, Mr. Hitchcock. I think that the Republicans will need some help from the Democrats in order to push through President Eisenhower's legislative program. Let's not forget that in this next session of the Congress, as of now, the Republicans in the House will have a three-vote margin, and in the Senate actually, with Senator Morse equivocating, we will have no majority in the Senate. So it is obvious that there will be a need for support, but let us look at this record of what happened in the last session of the Congress on the question of who supported Ike and to what extent.

The record shows that in the last session of the Congress, the Republicans as a whole *effectively* supported the President 77 per cent of the time. And the Democrats did support the President only about 48 per cent of the time. Now it is also true that there were a number of occasions where some pro-Eisenhower Democrats had to jump in and help to get some of

the measures recommended by the President enacted into law. But let me say this, that the record shows, and it cannot be denied, that the pro-Eisenhower Democrats were in the minority in both the House and the Senate, and also most of the opposition to the recommendations of the President the legislative recommendations, came from the Democrats.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Ford, let's forget the debt limit for another minute, because Mr. James is getting frustrated. He has had a question for a long time.

Mr. James: On precisely that same point, Mr. Ford, I would like to offer the idea for what it is worth, and it has certainly been expressed around the country a good bit, that the reason why President Eisenhower established such a wonderful record of getting such a large percentage of his requests okayed by the Congress was that he made so confounded few of a major sort. If you just listed one, two, three, four, five—some of the major problems which the Eisenhower Administration will tackle in the year 1954—look how many of them were postponed, turned over to commissions in the first year. No action was asked for.

Naturally Congress would come along and say, "Why certainly, Mr. President," to things which did not involve such basic issues as large-scale tax reduction; as the review of the farm program which is still in commission, I gather; as an attempted solution of labor-management problems still up in '54; as a greater reduction, rather than a token one, of government spending; and then again of the broadening of social security, which I believe is postponed till next year.

The whole thing has been wrapped up in some of the bes

advertising terms that any of the agencies in New York ever had. It is a progressive and dynamic program that has been advertised as such since the fall of 1952, and it seems to me as a newspaper reader that a good bit of it is a bit tardy. Now I really am serious in asking, is this going to evolve into a really new approach this next year? Will it be a new look or will it be a disguise given to the old one?

Mr. Ford: Mr. James, in my opinion, it would have been foolhardy and most unwise for a new administration to plunge headlong without some serious consideration and study into some of the problems which you mentioned and which we will handle in the next session of the Congress. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: I want to thank you, gentlemen, the interrogators and Mr. Ford, for getting us started so nicely on our discussion. I want to pause now to take some questions, and Mr. Ford can talk some more on these points that have been raised and so can the questioners. Ladies and gentlemen, each week Town Meeting presents a complete 20-volume set of the American People's Encyclopedia to a listener who submits the most provocative and timely question pertinent to the subject under discussion.

Tonight's question comes from William DeVree, 154 Claremont Street, Grand Rapids, Michigan. And by strange coincidence this

is from your home district, I think, Mr. Ford. The question is: "What are the possibilities of a bi-partisan approach to problems affecting our domestic affairs, as well as those pertinent to foreign affairs?" In other words, a bi-partisan domestic policy as well as a bi-partisan foreign policy. How would you deal with that question?

Mr. Ford: Well, as a matter of fact, on many issues involving domestic policy there is a high degree of bi-partisanship. I think that a good program, if submitted by the President, on a domestic issue will get bi-partisan support, and I suspect in the coming months, where there is such a close line of demarcation between the members of the House and the Senate who are Democrats and Republicans, that we will need a lot of help from both political parties, or the President will. I think there is no harm in having a bi-partisan domestic policy, and I think it will to some extent in the coming months be such.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Mr. Ford. Now we are ready to take questions from our audience here in Lexington, Kentucky, and we have a large group of men and women lined up here behind the microphone to ask these questions of Mr. Ford. The interrogators will have an opportunity to make comments and ask additional questions, if they wish, as the program proceeds. Could we start with a question from this gentleman right up front?

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Questioner: You gentlemen left the air force out, as I feel, personally. You spoke of the marines and the navy, and I am wondering about the appropriations for the air force in relation to those for the marines and navy, because I feel the battle will be decisive in one or two days with the use of atomic weapons.

Mr. Hitchcock: Would you like to answer that question, Mr. Ford?

Mr. Ford: From what I can foresee from the statements made by Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the requested appropriations for the air force for the next fiscal year will be more or less in line with what they received in the past several years. One thing that is often forgotten about military appropriations is that some of these departments have a huge backlog of appropriations.

For example, as of July 1 of 1953, this past July, the air force had on hand for future expenditure over 40 billion dollars—forty billion dollars for future expenditure! I think under good planning and good efficient organization that we can expect our air force to be well equipped for any emergencies in the future, with that much money on hand.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. James, would you like to say another few words for the navy?

Mr. James: Well, the last thing I can do is answer any question about employment of atomic energy and atomic defenses. The navy and marine corps, all the forces, as you know, are making use in their battle plans and in training of this new weapon of atomic energy. The army even has, as you know,

a cannon that will throw out an atomic shell, a warhead, miles across the country. I leave that up to Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, to Mr. Ford on the appropriations committee, but I would like to remind him that the newspapers quoted Admiral Radford as saying, after the Chiefs of Staff had a new look at our defense establishment, that they would go along with it, that there was nothing particularly new about it except that it leaves 1954 as being the only real year of crisis, that it was something that would have to extend and expand into the future.

Mr. Hitchcock: All right. Thank you. Now can we take another question from the lady.

Questioner: Will the eighty-third Congress reduce taxes, and if so what are the most likely taxes to be reduced?

Mr. Hitchcock: We taxpayers are very much interested in that, Mr. Ford.

Mr. Ford: I believe that the second session of the eighty-third Congress will make reductions and revisions in our tax structure. One of the points that I am certain will be covered will be relief for the so-called working mother category. The present law does not give any relief for the woman who happens to have children, and she has to have a job to support those children. I am quite certain that the Secretary of the Treasury will make a recommendation to give relief there. I also feel, Dr. Hitchcock, that the Congress will make some provision to permit students to earn more than six hundred dollars before penalizing their parents under the exemption.

In other words, there is going to

some recognition given that you cannot send a child to school on the six hundred-dollar exemption. I feel also there is some prospect that there will be an over-all increase in the exemption itself from six hundred to maybe seven hundred, or somewhere along that line. In addition, I have some reason to believe that there may be some effort made to do away with double taxation and corporate profits—for example, the taxation of dividends. I doubt if there will be full-scale relief in that regard, but there may be some. There should also be some reductions and revisions in the manufacturers' excise taxes which we have at the present time. There are many, as all of you know, that should have some readjustments and revisions made.

Mr. Hitchcock: I think Mr. Underwood wants to pursue this topic.

Mr. Underwood: I just wanted to ask you a question. The first question probably that will come up is whether the recommendation of Chairman Reed of the House Ways and Means Committee, who has urged that the tax revision bill be taken up first, is followed or whether the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury Humphreys, who has recommended that it be held until other tax measures are agreed upon and all voted on at once, will be followed.

Mr. Ford: Mr. Underwood, I really cannot answer that question. It is a matter of the strategy of the House and Senate leadership and the White House. That is something that has got to be worked out in this conference.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you. Now I see Dr. Donovan in the audience, President of the University of Kentucky, and he has a question for Mr. Ford.

Dr. Donovan: Mr. Ford, what agricultural program do you believe the President and Secretary of Agriculture Benson will recommend to Congress, and what chance will it have of passing?

Mr. Ford: Doctor, I cannot be specific about the program that the President and Secretary Benson will recommend. There are several alternatives. There is continuation of the present program. There is the reverting to the flexible price support program. There is the so-called two-price program. I suspect that there might be some variation, crop to crop—in some cases using one, and in some cases another. I think what they are going to try to do is to increase the exporting of agricultural commodities, greater utilization of agricultural commodities in other fields, in order to work down these burdensome surpluses which we have, which are causing the real difficulties we are facing at the present time.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Underwood?

Mr. Underwood: Mr. Chairman, I think that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan was one of the twelve who voted against the agricultural appropriations bill. I wonder if he would like to tell us why he did that.

Mr. Ford: I certainly did, and I will be very glad to tell you, Tom, for this reason. The President had recommended 140 million dollars for the agricultural conservation payments. We had quite a struggle on the floor of the House. Some of the members wanted to raise that to 250 million, a sizable amount over what the President proposed and, unfortunately, those of us who wanted the lower figure lost. I just didn't want to be on record in support of 250 million for ACP payments when the President recommended 140 million.

Mr. Hitchcock: Next question, please.

Questioner: I would like to know, Representative Ford, what the possibilities of UMT to be set up during this session of Congress. What are the possibilities of it?

Mr. Ford: Frankly, I don't think UMT will be favorably acted upon during this session of the Congress.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, sir. Could we have another question?

Questioner: I would like to ask you, what are the chances for allocating more funds for the Point Four program this coming legislature?

Mr. Ford: I think that the President will probably recommend about as much, maybe slightly more funds, for Point Four. I suspect that the Congress will go along more or less with what he proposes in this category.

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. James, would you like to come in?

Mr. James: Mr. Ford, this whole question of money fascinates me. I would like to hear where you think we are going to be able to make these savings, in view of this estimate which I believe is just about as official as Secretary Humphrey's tax people can make it on the legislation passed by the Democrats way back when they were in control of Congress. We are going to have about eight billion dollars' worth of taxes expiring between now and, say, April 1. That is eight billion laid onto a country already working under a deficit.

We are going to have, even with Mr. Humphrey's most favorable figures, a deficit of more than three billions—generally taken to be between three and four. That gives you roughly twelve billion dollars down the drain, or in the hole,

or however you want to express it. On top of that, you suggest that we can cut taxes additionally, save money, and still keep the defense establishment going, the foreign aid program going.

Mr. Ford: I think, Mr. James, that the figure of 3.8 billion suggested by Mr. Humphrey is the possible deficit. It takes into account the ten per cent income-tax reduction which goes into effect January 1 and the expiration of the excess profits tax. That figure takes into account those taxes which are expiring, and it may take into account one or two of the minor excises which are expiring.

Questioner: What opportunity is there for our basic civil liberties to survive the present attacks by McCarthyites? And does the Eisenhower administration contemplate any legislation to protect these liberties?

Mr. Ford: I believe that the present Congress in the next session will continue to conduct certain investigations of subversion throughout government and elsewhere. I believe, however, that those investigations will be conducted fairly and equitably. I don't think that there is any need for legislation along that line; it is simply a need on the part of Congress for its members to conduct themselves fairly and justly.

Mr. Hitchcock: The gentleman, I think, wants to make a comment.

Questioner: Just one comment if I may. In the past several months we have noticed the ability of men like Senator McCarthy to speak in the name of the Republican Party, or to call the Republican Party to task, and many of us wonder in the months that have passed ahead if he will continue to

the tune for this party that is now in power. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Ford: I presume you are referring, Rabbi, to the question as to whether or not communism will be an issue in the months ahead. In my opinion, communism will be an issue in the months ahead if the Democratic candidates for the House and the Senate are going to try to defend what the previous administration did in the handling of communism within government. Communism will not be an issue in the 1954 elections if the Democratic candidates for the House and Senate say, "we made a mistake and we are going to try and rectify it if we are elected."

Mr. Hitchcock: Our time is rapidly going, and we want to get to more questioners. Could we take Mr. James' comment very quickly.

Mr. James: It isn't a question of waiting until next year and seeing whether the issue is there. If you take the word of one good Republican commentator, Mr. David Lawrence, he says that Eisenhower is committing political suicide by making an issue of McCarthyism in the case in which Mr. Dulles is criticized. On the same subject, Mr. Lawrence continued that President Eisenhower is destroying the morale of the Republican Party. Now it is that evidence of a split within the ranks, when questions like that are raised, that makes us wonder about the possibilities of the whole legislative program.

Mr. Hitchcock: Could we take another question from the lady?

Questioner: I would like to ask, how can social security benefits be increased and keep the payroll deduction where it is at present?

Mr. Hitchcock: Mr. Ford.

Mr. Ford: Well, your social security program is, primarily, in the next session of Congress going to be broadened. About ten million 500 thousand new people will be covered. I am not so sure that we can expect any increase in the benefits. There will just be more beneficiaries who will make payments under the program and then thereafter receive benefits from it.

Mr. Hitchcock: Another quick question.

Questioner: Congressman, as these agricultural surpluses arise, how can Congress legislate to permit consumers to enjoy lower food prices and still protect the farmers' necessary costs?

Mr. Ford: I think that in the long run you can combine the two.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, gentlemen, for your most interesting discussion. Our thanks to the officials of the Lexington Community Concert and Lecture Series: Mr. John L. Carter, General Manager, and Mr. Clay Stewart; Professor R. D. MacIntyre and Dr. Herman Donovan for their very fine cooperation. Our appreciation also to Mr. Ed Willis and his staff at Station WLAP.



FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

1. During a recent press conference, Pres. Eisenhower stated that the future political complexion of Congress will depend upon "the efficiency and vision with which Government is administered by this Republican Administration and whether or not the Congress enacts a progressive, dynamic program." Do you agree?

THE PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

1. What is the President's legislative program? To what extent has it been spelled out? What will be the top priority issues?
2. Fiscal Policy.
 - a. Will the Administration attempt to balance the budget? Can it be done?
 - b. What kind of tax reforms is the President expected to propose?
 - c. What are the prospects for a federal retail sales tax or a manufacturer's sales tax?
3. Farm Policy.
 - a. What does the Administration expect to do about the agricultural recession?
 - b. Secy. Benson recently pointed out that the new farm program will be fundamentally like the present program but with various improvements. What improvements are likely to be made?
4. Is there likely to be any opposition to the proposed expansion of social security coverage?
5. What changes, if any, can be expected in our defense program?
6. What specific changes in the Taft-Hartley Labor Law will be requested by the Administration?
7. Foreign Aid and Trade
 - a. Will foreign aid be confined primarily to military assistance?
 - b. What sort of program can we expect with regard to reciprocal trade?
8. Are any major changes in basic foreign policy anticipated? How will Congress receive the President's proposal for an international atomic pool for peacetime purposes?
9. Can we anticipate expansion or curtailment of public housing and slum clearance programs?
10. What kind of proposals has the Administration made in the following fields?
 - civil rights
 - wiretap and immunity legislation
 - development of large scale hydroelectric and reclamation projects
 - development of the St. Lawrence Seaway
 - statehood for Hawaii and Alaska

11. To what extent will the "communism in government" issue pre-occupy the Republican Administration and Party during the next legislative session?

THE PRESIDENT AND THE ELECTIONS

1. Is it true that the 1952 election was more an Eisenhower victory than a Republican Party victory?
2. Evaluate the Republican defeats in recent congressional elections in Wisconsin and New Jersey in the light of Pres. Eisenhower's overwhelming victory in 1952.
 - a. Do these defeats in normally Republican districts indicate, as the Democrats claim, that the Administration has not been fulfilling campaign promises?
 - b. Or, is Rep. Clarence Brown, of Ohio, correct in stating that these defeats came about because, "the people voted for a change (in 1952) and don't feel they got it"?
 - c. Were these elections decided on the basis of purely local issues?
 - d. Evaluate Sen. McCarthy's contention that the Administration's failure to make an issue of "communism in government" was responsible for these defeats.
3. Chairman Leonard Hall of the Republican National Committee has stated that "communism is going to be one of the main issues" in the 1954 election. Do you agree?
4. Is Chairman Stephen Mitchell of the Democratic National Committee correct in saying that the people won't "eat warmed-over spy"?

THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

1. Can Pres. Eisenhower rely on the Republicans in Congress to support his program? Or, will he strike at the unity of his party every time he takes a strong stand, especially on foreign policy?
2. Do you agree with Rep. John McCormack of Mass. that "the few major recommendations of Pres. Eisenhower enacted into law have been done only as a result of Democratic support"?
3. What role will the Democrats play in the next session—"constructive opposition" or just "opposition"? On what issues are the Democrats likely to support or oppose the President?
4. Is Pres. Eisenhower expected to exercise more vigorous executive leadership during the next legislative session? Does the concept of the co-equality of the executive and legislative branches preclude strong executive leadership?
5. Evaluate the proposal of Sen. Homer E. Capehart to reconstitute the Senate Republican Policy Committee by making each of 15 chairmen of Senate legislative committees a member.



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 19

10. HOW CAN WE COMPETE WITH COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA? Edward W. Barrett, Rep. Alvin M. Bentley, July 7, 1953.
11. WHAT SHOULD BE THE FUNCTION OF OUR OVERSEAS LIBRARIES? Rep. Charles J. Kersten, Dan Lacy, July 14, 1953.
12. RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA: BRITISH-AMERICAN ATTITUDES. In New York City—Sen. Ralph E. Flanders, In London—Edwin H. C. Leather. Moderators: In New York City—John Mac Vane, In London—James F. Murray, Jr. July 21, 1953, Recorded in New York City.
13. WHAT IS HAPPENING BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN? Frank W. Rounds, Jr., Harry Schwartz, Interrogators: Leo Cherne, James L. Wick, July 28, 1953.
14. IS INFLATION A THREAT NOW? Lawrence Fertig, Kenneth Kramer, August 4, 1953.
15. WHAT HAS THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION ACCOMPLISHED? Sen. A. S. Mike Monroney, Rep. Hugh Scott, August 11, 1953.
16. WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED FROM KOREA? Hon. Harry P. Cain, Rep. Laurie C. Battle, Harold Lavine, August 18, 1953.
17. EAST-WEST TRADE: BRITISH AND AMERICAN ATTITUDES. Hugh Gaitskill, Owen Brewster, August 25, 1953.
18. EUROPEAN YOUTH LOOKS AT AMERICA. Ruth Bradley—Great Britain. Maria Scotti—Italy. Margaretta Brogren—Sweden. Helen Korleti—Greece. Guest Historian: Henry Steele Commager, September 1, 1953.
19. REPORT ON INDIA AND THE EAST. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. Interrogators: James A. Michener, Sirdar J. J. Singh, September 8, 1953.
20. OUR AMERICAN FREEDOMS—1787-1953. Rev. Robert C. Hartnett, August Hecksher, Robert A. Vogeler, September 15, 1953.
21. DISARMAMENT: HOW AND WHEN? Sen. Ralph E. Flanders, Joseph F. Johnson, R. W. G. Mackay, September 22, 1953.
22. ATOMIC POWER—MANKIND'S BOON OR DESTRUCTION? Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, Dr. Paul Aebersold, September 29, 1953.
23. WHAT MAKES PROSPERITY—MAN OR MACHINE? Paul Mazur, Robert S. Byfield, October 6, 1953.
24. SHOULD WE TALK WITH RUSSIA? Rep. John M. Vorys, William F. Deedes, October 13, 1953.
25. HOW CAN OUR SCHOOLS BEST PROMOTE DEMOCRACY? Dr. Hollis L. Caswell, Dr. W. Robert Smith, October 20, 1953.
26. ATOMIC DEFENSE: HOW MUCH AND WHERE? Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Dr. James R. Killiam, Jr. October 27, 1953.
27. HOW CAN WE HELP SATELLITE NATIONS TO OBTAIN FREEDOM? Lt. Francis Jarecki, Rep. Alvin E. O'Konski, Ernest K. Lindley. November 3, 1953.
28. IS THERE A PLACE FOR NEUTRALISM IN THE WORLD TODAY? W. Averell Harriman, A. S. Lall. November 10, 1953.
29. IS INDUSTRY EFFECTIVELY USING THE LIBERAL ARTS GRADUATE? Robert J. Blakely, Earl Bunting, Cecil Puckett. November 17, 1953.
30. WHAT CAN WE EXPECT IN KOREA? Col. Ben C. Limb, Robert Aura Smith. November 24, 1953.
31. ARE THE STATES YIELDING TOO MUCH POWER TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT? Charles B. Brownson, Richard Bolling, Dec. 1, 1953.
32. HOW CAN WE STAY ALIVE ON THE HIGHWAY? G. D. Sontheimer, David M. Baldwin, December 8, 1953.

Order single copies at 25c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.
New York 36, N. Y.

Bulletins prior to Volume 19, Number 13, are only 15c a copy.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:.....

{	26 Weeks for Only
	\$3.00
	Single Copies 25c